

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 18 2005**PIPER RUDNICK
GRAYCARY**DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, California 94303-2248
O 650.833.2052
F 650.833.2001
W www.dlapiper.com**FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET**

February 18, 2005

To: Examiner C. Michelle Colon
Group Art Unit 3623**Telephone:****Fax Number:****Centralized Facsimile Number**
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office**(703) 872-9306****From: David Alberti**
650.833.2052**Client-Matter Number: 2101197-991101****Re: United States Patent Application No. 09/586,722**
Filed: June 5, 2000**Entitled: DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM AND METHOD THAT PROVIDES AN
INTEGRATED AND COMPREHENSIVE USER INTERFACE FOR ANALYSIS OF
VALUE CREATION PERFORMANCE OF A BUSINESS ENTERPRISE**
Inventor: Robert I.G. McLEAN et al.**Pages: 2 - (including this form)****Originals: will not follow****If there is a problem with this transmission, please call Jan Huss at 650-833-2000****Fax Operator/Ext. xt 1569****Message:****Please provide the attached Agenda For Interview of March 1, 2005 (3P.M. E.S.T.) relating to
the above referenced application to Examiner Catherine M. Colon.****Thank you.****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE**

This communication is ONLY for the person named above. Unless otherwise indicated, it contains information that is confidential, privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the person named above, or responsible for delivering it to that person, be aware that disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this communication is strictly PROHIBITED. If you have received it in error, or are uncertain as to its proper handling, please immediately notify us by collect telephone and mail the original to us at the above address. Thank you.

Serving clients globally

EM7180811.1

AGENDA FOR INTERVIEW OF MARCH 1, 2005 (3 P.M. E.S.T.)
U.S. PAT. APP. S/N 09/586,722

Applicants' counsel would like to discuss the following issues:

1. On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 18-22 under §101 on the basis that the claims did not recite a connection to the use of a computer or other technology. The Examiner has requested the Applicant point out which steps may have a connection to a computer. Applicant has followed the Examiner's instructions and has amended each of the independent claims to specifically indicate that certain steps are performed "by use of a computer system." Applicants' counsel would like to confirm that these amendments satisfy the Examiner's concerns and are sufficient to overcome the rejection.
2. On pages 5 and 6 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the authorization limitations of the claims were unclear with respect to use of the term "according to," and could therefore, read on Eder. In response, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 5, 14 and 18 to specify that the authorization of selected assumed variables is "based on a level of authorization of each user and a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned, wherein different levels of authorization have access to different levels of assumed variables." Independent claim 10 was amended to also incorporate the authorization concept with respect to the ability to provide real-time feedback to the system. Particularly, claim 10 was amended to recite "selectively authorizing a plurality of users to provide real-time feedback on the value creation performance of the business enterprise based on a level of authorization of each user, wherein only certain levels of authorization are permitted to provide real-time feedback." Eder fails to disclose or suggest such a multi-level authorization system or method. Applicants' counsel would like to confirm that these amendments satisfy the Examiner's concerns and are sufficient to overcome the rejection.